

**REMARKS**

This Amendment responds to the office action dated November 27, 2006.

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 6, 8 and 10-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Costello (U.S. 5,547,178) (hereinafter Costello).

This rejection is improper because it fails to present a prima facie case of anticipation. Costello teaches a method whereby a separate banner page print job is sent to a printer and coordinated with another print job to print a banner page that is output from the printer immediately before or after the print job with which it is coordinated. Costello teaches the use of distinctly different banner page print jobs that are associated with, but distinct from the print jobs with which they are associated. The method taught in Costello uses a separate banner page print job that, while coordinated with the associated print job, remains distinct therefrom and can be separated therefrom through printer error or other errors in the print stream. If an error occurs with the associated print job or the banner page print job, the banner page may be separated from the associated print job or may not print at all. If an error occurs for one job, but not the other, the system may try to reprint the unprinted job in an out-of-order sequence thereby destroying the association between the distinct print job and its previously-associated banner page print job.

The embodiments of the present invention described in these claims comprise a single, integrated print job, not two associated print jobs. The single, integrated print job cannot be separated from the banner page or separator page because they are single print job that will be reprinted in its entirety if an error occurs and not simply coordinated

output from a printer. Claims 12 and 13 further distinguish from the coordinate printer output of Costello because the single, integrated print job is a modified spool file comprising the separator page and the original print job. Costello does not teach modification of the spool file to integrate the separator page information into a modified spool file.

The examiner cites Costello (col. 1, lines 25-30) as disclosing single, integrated print job. Costello, at this location, only teaches coordinated print output and specifically states that the banner page is printed before or after the coordinated print job. Costello states “a banner sheet may be automatically printed by the printer and automatically inserted before or after the printing of the first or last sheets of each *print job*.“ Clearly, if the banner sheet is printed before or after the first and last sheets of the print job, the banner sheet is not part of the print job and is not part of a single, integrated print job. The examiner seems to be confusing the term “print job” with hard copy printer media in the print output tray. A print job is a distinct file that is sent to the printer for conversion by the printer into hard copy, not the result of the printer’s conversion process. Regardless, Costello clearly makes distinguishes the banner page from the print job when he states that the banner page is printed “before or after” the *print job*.

Claim 2-5, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Costello (U.S. 5,547,178) (hereinafter Costello) in view of Snipp (U.S. 5,699,495) (hereinafter Snipp).

This rejection is improper as it fails to present a prima facie case of obviousness. This combination of reference does not disclose all the limitations of the currently rejected claims. Costello teaches a method of inserting banner pages around print jobs that are redirected from their initial destination. Snipp teaches a method of managing printer drivers and printer resources in a distributed environment. The examiner relies on Costello to teach all the limitations of claim 1. As stated above in relation to claim 1 and other claims, Costello does not teach the single, integrated print job comprising the original print job and a job separator page. Snipp does not teach any method of creating or employing a job separator page. Accordingly, the combination of Costello and Snipp does not render these claims obvious as this combination does not teach the single, integrated print job limitation.

In relation to claim 2, the examiner relies on Snipp to teach a print processor that analyzes a print job to identify print job characteristics to be included on a print job separator page. While Snipp discloses a typical print processor, he does not teach any analysis functions of the print processor nor does he teach any relation between the print processor and a job separator page. The combination of Costello and Snipp does not disclose a print processor that analyzes a print job to identify print job characteristics to be included on a print job separator page, which is an element of claim 2. Accordingly, this rejection does not present a prima facie case of obviousness for claim 2.

In relation to claim 3, the examiner relies on Snipp to teach a spooler that analyzes a print job to identify print job characteristics to be included on a print job separator page. While Snipp discloses a typical spooler, he does not teach any analysis

functions of the spooler nor does he teach any relation between the spooler and a job separator page. The combination of Costello and Snipp does not disclose a spooler that analyzes a print job to identify print job characteristics to be included on a print job separator page, which is an element of claim 3. Accordingly, this rejection does not present a prima facie case of obviousness for claim 3.

In relation to claim 4, the examiner relies on Snipp to teach a print assistant that analyzes a print job to identify print job characteristics to be included on a print job separator page. While Snipp discloses a typical print driver, he does not teach any analysis functions of the print driver nor does he teach any relation between the print driver and a job separator page. The combination of Costello and Snipp does not disclose a print assistant that analyzes a print job to identify print job characteristics to be included on a print job separator page, which is an element of claim 4. Accordingly, this rejection does not present a prima facie case of obviousness for claim 4.

In relation to claim 5, the examiner relies on Snipp to teach a print server that analyzes a print job to identify print job characteristics to be included on a print job separator page. While Snipp discloses a typical print server, he does not teach any analysis functions of the print server nor does he teach any relation between the print server and a job separator page. The combination of Costello and Snipp does not disclose a print server that analyzes a print job to identify print job characteristics to be included on a print job separator page, which is an element of claim 5. Accordingly, this rejection does not present a prima facie case of obviousness for claim 5.

In relation to claim 7, the examiner relies on Snipp to teach sending a combined print job to a print server. Claim 7 was amended in the response to the last office action to comprise sending a single, integrated print job to a print server. While Snipp discloses a typical print server, he does not teach sending a single, integrated print job comprising a job separator page to a print server. The combination of Costello and Snipp does not disclose sending a single, integrated print job comprising a job separator page to a print server, which is an element of claim 7. Accordingly, this rejection does not present a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claim 7.

In relation to claim 9, the examiner relies on Snipp to teach creating a new print job file comprising data for said print job separator page and said original print job. While Snipp may disclose a typical print stream process comprising conversion of GDI commands. The combination of Costello and Snipp does not disclose creating a single, integrated print job that is a new print job comprising a job separator page and an original print job, which is an element of claim 9. Accordingly, this rejection does not present a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claim 9.

Claim 15 is amended to bring it into compliance with current guidelines for computer-related inventions.

Appl. No. 09/683,162  
Amdt. dated February 27, 2007  
Reply to Office action of November 27, 2006

Claim 16 is canceled.

Based on the foregoing remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests  
reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott C. Krieger/  
Scott C. Krieger  
Reg. No. 42,768  
Tel. No.: (360) 828-0589